


Remarks

In the Office Action of Aug. 5, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Wilson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,116,384). Claims 1-3 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Philips (U.S. Patent No. 6,206, 934). Herein, claim 1 has been amended, claims 10-22 have been canceled, and claims 23-29 have been added for consideration and examination. No new matter has been introduced.

Pursuant to a personal interview with the Examiner on November 16, 2004, Applicants submitted an amendment on December 6, 2004, under a misunderstanding that the amendment reflected agreed changes that would result in an allowance. The Examiner did not enter the amendment of December 6, 2004, as indicated in an Advisory Action of January 4, 2004. In a subsequent phone interview with Applicant's representative, Joseph Buczynski, the Examiner cited additional references Doddroe et al and Phillips, U.S. Patent Nos. 6,280,497 and 6,602,295 respectively. It is believed that claim 1, as amended, overcomes the rejection in the Office Action of August 5, 2004 and patentably distinguishes over Doddroe et al and Phillips. Therefore the Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw all of the rejections and to allow claim 1 and claims 2-9 dependent thereon.

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas A. Belush, Reg. No. 37,090
One of the Attorneys for Applicant(s)
GARDNER CARTON & DOUGLAS LLP
191 North Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: February 7, 2005